Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—With your leave, Sir, I beg to oppose this motion. I realise, Sir, that it has been the practice on this side of the House for non-officials not to thwart the introduction of bills provided they do not materially affect the people of different castes and creeds living in the State. This Bill, the Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill, seems to me to be an exception. I don't think that there is any necessity or that there is any justification for the introduction of this Bill in the Cochin State at least during the present times. The Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill will be a very pernicious measure tending to disrupt society, to create confusion and to hamper the well being of the different classes and creeds of His Highness' subjects. It is obvious that there is no compulsion for any body to be in the fold of any particular religion. If anybody wants to change his religion he is welcome so that instead of creating confusion by the extension of vested rights to a convert from one religion to another it would be in the best interests of persons so minded to take whatever they can from the original family if that is permissible, get himself converted and do as he pleases. In the objects and reasons given for the introduction of this Bill, in section 4, it is stated "so much of any law or usage now in force in Cochin as inflicts on any person, forfeiture of rights of property or may be held in any way to impair or affect any rights of inheritance by reason of his renouncing or having been excluded from the communion of any religion or being deprived of caste shall cease to be enforced as law in the Courts of the State." So far as that section is concerned, that is the only substantial section in the regulation, the convert should not lose his vested rights in the property even if he.....

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—On a point of order. Under S. O. 30 if a motion for leave to introduce is opposed the President after permitting the mover of the bill to give a brief explanatory statement shall call for a statement from the Member who opposed. So the statement is to come from the Mover of the bill.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Generally leave to introduce is given to all bills and, therefore, I think my bill also will share the same privilege or fate. Why should this bill be singled out for a differential treatment?

Motion put and carried.

The Cochin Civil Marriage Bill.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—I rise to move for leave to introduce the Cochin Civil Marriage Bill.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—I second the motion.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—I oppose the motion for leave to introduce the Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—There is no reason why it should be opposed at this stage.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—If the President allows me I shall also make a brief statement of my position. The objects and reasons assigned to this bill show that love knows no distinction of caste, creed or colour. All restrictions upon marriage between various castes and creeds should be removed. I submit at this time when we have got so many different castes and creed here and then the problem of development of different castes and community is engaging our attention there is no reason why this intercaste Civil Marriage Bill should be introduced here. Here again, this is simply an appendage to the Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill. It is simply in the nature of a corollary to the other main bill and my own opinion is that it will be productive of immense harm to all the several classes and creeds in Cochin. Of course, it is unnecessary that I should dilate upon this subject now because if leave happens to be given there will be time enough to consider the question in detail. I submit that there is absolutely no reason for granting leave. The bill is bound to disrupt society and it will be highly prejudicial to all classes and creeds of His Highness' subjects in the State. It would promote licentiousness and immorality and it will be an impediment to the steady progress of His Highness' subjects in the State.

Motion put and carried.

Resolutions on matters of General public interest

15. Proclamation to abolish untouchability and unapproachability (*contd.*)

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Will the Hon'ble Mover give a clear definition of the word 'Untouchability'.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—It is very difficult to define things. Everybody knows what untouchability is. Please define a mango. It is very difficult. Yet everybody knows what a mango is.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Does it include temple entry also. The same is not the case with the mangoes. That is the difference.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Mr. President, Sir, I rise to support this resolution and I hope I would not be considered as intruding upon a matter which is a domestic affair of the Hindu Community. I have ventured to support this motion, first because I think it seeks to vindicate one of the most fundamental birthrights of a man. (*Hear, hear.*) I have also ventured to support this motion because I think it would remove a slur which has all along been cast upon the sacred personality of the individual. Again, I have ventured to support this motion be-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly